

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-15 are now present in the application. The specification and claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 12-15 have been added. Claims 1 and 7 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 7-10 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, allowable claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of its base claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 7 and its dependent claims 8-10 are in condition for allowance.

Specification Objections

The specification has been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, in which the Examiner's helpful suggestions have been followed, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Allen, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0028295. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of LaRue, U.S. Patent No. 6,509,715. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including “a base connected to the housing for automatically feeding paper to be scanned by the scanning module”. Support for the above combination of elements can be found on the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Allen discloses a portable document scan device 12 for a PDA 14. However, Allen merely discloses manually scanning the document by moving the scan device 12. Allen fails to disclose any automatic paper-feed mechanism in order to perform the automatic paper-feed scan. Therefore, Allen fails to teach “a base connected to the housing for automatically feeding paper to be scanned by the scanning module” as recited in amended claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on LaRue, this reference has only been relied on for its teachings related to the subject matter of claim 4. This reference also fails to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, LaRue fails to cure the deficiencies of Allen.

Accordingly, neither of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teaches or suggests the limitations of amended independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 12-15 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-15 are allowable due to their respective dependence on independent claim 1, as well as due to the additional recitations included in these claims.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 12-15 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant